

## **Remarks**

### **I. Administrative Overview**

Claims 1-22 were presented for examination. Claims 1-14 and 18-19 have been amended; and Claim 17 has been cancelled. Upon entry of the present amendments, Claims 1-22 are presented for examination. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections to the claims as amended.

### **II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-5 and 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 7,203,941 to Demsey et al. (“Demsey”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,253,145 to Goldberg (“Goldberg”). Claims 6-7 and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Demsey in view of Goldberg and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 7,206,819 to Schmidt (“Schmidt”). Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-5 and 8-13 as previously presented are patentable over Demsey in view of Goldberg; and Claims 6-7 and 14-22 as previously presented are patentable over Demsey in view of Goldberg and in further view of Schmidt. Nevertheless, Claims 1-14 and 18-19 have been amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention; and Claim 17 has been cancelled. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 1-16 and 18-22, as amended, are patentable over any combination of Demsey, Goldberg and Schmidt.

A claimed invention is obvious when two or more references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of Demsey, Goldberg and Schmidt fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claimed invention.

Demsey fails to teach or suggest a “rule action specifying remap” associated with the virtual name as required by independent Claims 1 and 14. The table described in Demsey is not used to determine that a rule action that specifies remap is associated with the virtual name. Instead, Demsey describes a native resource handle table that “tracks the requested native resource to associate it with a domain of the application.” *See* Demsey, col. 3, lines 54-56. The allocation of a native resource to a particular application domain requires a routine to review the

native resource handle tables to determine if there is an available handle associated with the requested native resource. *See* Demsey, col. 4, lines 18-38. Using a table to track whether a handle associated with a native resource is available is not the same as determining whether a rule action specifying remap is associated with the virtual name associated with the requested native resource. Thus, Demsey does not teach or suggest that a “rule action specifying remap” is associated with the virtual name.

As with Demsey, Goldberg also fails to teach or suggest a “rule action specifying remap” associated with the virtual name as required by independent Claims 1 and 14. Goldberg describes a mapping mechanism that associates virtual resources having virtual names with real resources on a host computer, the real resources having real names. The mapping mechanism consists of a one map that maps the virtual resources to the virtual names, a second map that maps the real resources to the real names, and a composer mechanism that combines the two maps to establish correspondence between the virtual resources and the real resources. *See* Goldberg col. 9, lines 25-50. Goldberg does not teach or even suggest rule actions associated with the virtual names much less a rule action that specifies remap. Thus, Goldberg fails to teach or suggest “determining that a rule action specifying remap is associated with the virtual name included in the received request.”

As with both Demsey and Goldberg, Schmidt also fails to teach or suggest a “rule action specifying remap” associated with the virtual name as required by independent Claims 1 and 14. For this reason, any combination of Demsey, Goldberg and Schmidt fails to disclose each and every limitation of independent Claims 1 and 14. Claims 1 and 14 are therefore patentable over any combination of Demsey, Goldberg and Schmidt. Claims 2-13 and 15-16 and 18-22 are dependent on Claims 1 and 14 and so are also patentable over any combination of Demsey, Goldberg and Schmidt. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

### **III. Conclusion**

Applicants contend that the Examiner's rejections are adequately addressed by the above-made remarks, and that all of the pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' agent would expedite prosecution of this application; the Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' agent at the particulars identified below.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP

Date: October 12, 2008

/Kellan D. Ponikiewicz/  
Kellan D. Ponikiewicz  
Registration Number: 59,701

Patent Group  
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP  
Two International Place  
Boston, MA 02110  
Phone: (617) 248-5000  
Fax: (617) 502-5002